



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/585,264	07/05/2006	Xianyi Chen	CU-4908 RJS	2404
26530 7590 12/16/2009 LADAS & PARRY LLP 224 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE SUITE 1600 CHICAGO, IL 60604				
EXAMINER				
CALLAHAN, PAUL E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2437				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/16/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/585,264

**Applicant(s)**

CHEN ET AL.

**Examiner**

PAUL CALLAHAN

**Art Unit**

2437

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2006.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.  
7) ☒ Claim(s) 10-13 is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 July 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-13 are pending and have been examined.

***Priority***

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marples et al., US 2003/0140142, and Piche, US 7,522,594.

As for claim 1, Marples teaches a network security system (abstract), comprising a firewall arranged between an internal network and an external network (fig. 2, element 222, [0014]), said firewall comprises a first port configured at the internal network oriented side of the firewall and a second port configured at the external network oriented side of the firewall (fig. 2 element 222, [0014]); wherein the network security system further comprises a trusted node arranged between the firewall and the

external network (fig. 2 element 200, [0014], [0015]: "...route the communications over the hub and through the firewall) which is used to provide a data channel between the internal network and external network ([0014], [0015]), and forward the data transported between the internal network and external network ([0014], [0015]).

Marples does not teach the trusted node as comprising a media-stream receiving port used to converge the data from the second port. However, Piche does teach the use of such a first and second port for streaming media applications (col. 9 lines 64-67, col. 11 lines 5-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this feature into the system of Marples. It would have been obvious to do so since this would allow for more rapid transmission of streaming media from an external network to the internal network of Marples, and increase the utility of the system of Marples by extending its use to commonly utilized network media delivery formats.

As for claim 2, Marples teaches the network security system according to claim 1, wherein the trusted node further comprises a data forward unit, which is used to forward the data transported between the internal network and the external network ([0017]), and a control unit, which is used to control the operations of all the other units ([0014], [0015], [0017]). a signaling channel selection unit, which is used to select signaling transmission channel for transmitting the data so as to implement the convergence of signaling (fig. 4, col. 12 lines 55-67), and a call channel selection unit, which is used to select a media-stream receiving port in the trusted node for

communicating with the internal network (fig. 4, col. 12 lines 55-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this feature into the system of Marples. It would have been obvious to do so since this would allow for more rapid transmission of streaming media from an external network to the internal network of Marples, and increase the utility of the system of Marples by extending its use to commonly utilized network media delivery formats.

As for claim 6, this claim is directed towards the method that is carried out by the system of claims 1 and 2. Claim 6 recites substantially the same limitations as claims 1 and 2 and is therefore rejected on the same basis as those claims.

As per claim 7, Marples teaches the network security method according to claim 6, but not explicitly further wherein the Step B comprises the following: B1, Open Logical Channel signaling being transmitted by the internal network to the trusted node; B2, the trusted node informing the internal network of the selected media-stream receiving port; B3, the trusted node transmitting Open Logical Channel signaling to the external network to establish a corresponding channel. However, Piche does teach these steps (fig. 3, col. 6 lines 5-27). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this feature into the system of Marples. It would have been obvious to do so since this would increase the utility of the system of Marples by extending its use to commonly utilized

firewall port discovery protocols.

As for claim 8, Marples teaches the network security method according to claim 6, but not explicitly further wherein the Step C comprises the following: C1, the selected media-stream receiving port of the trusted node receiving all the data from the internal network and forwarding the data to the external network; C2, the selected media-stream receiving port of the trusted node forwarding the data transmitted by the external network to the internal network. However, Piche does teach these steps (fig. 3, col. 6 lines 27 through col. 7 line 7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this feature into the system of Marples. It would have been obvious to do so since this would increase the utility of the system of Marples by extending its use to commonly utilized data packet transmission protocols.

5. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marples and Piche as applied to claim 1 supra, and further in view of Bush et al., US 2009/0019141 A1.

As for claims 3 and 4, the combination of Marples and Piche teaches the network security system according to claims 1 and 2, but not explicitly further wherein the trusted node is designed to support the H.323 protocol. However, Bush does teach such a trusted node (gateway) utilizing the H.323 protocol. Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this feature into the system of Marples and Piche. It would have been obvious to do so since this would increase the utility of the system of Marples and Piche by extending its use to commonly utilized network media delivery formats.

6. Claims 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marples and Piche as applied to claim 2 supra, and further in view of Freebairn et al., US 2007/0067487 A1.

As for claims 5 and 9, the combination of Marples and Piche teaches the network security system according to claims 2 and 6, but not explicitly further wherein the signaling channel selection unit adopts Q931 channel for transmitting signaling. However, Freebairn does teach such a trusted node utilizing the Q931 protocol. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this feature into the system of Marples and Piche. It would have been obvious to do so since this would increase the utility of the system of Marples and Piche by extending its use to commonly utilized signaling channel protocol.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. Claims 10-13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul E. Callahan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3869. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise, can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is: (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/PEC/  
AU2437

/Emmanuel L. Moise/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437



